

Appln No. 09/608,022  
Amdt. Dated September 12, 2003  
Reply to Office action of August 13, 2003

2

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Examiner has suggested that the claims contain six separate inventions, namely claims 1, 4 and 5 and their respective dependent claims representing inventions I, II and III respectively and claims 29, 32 and 33 and their respective dependent claims representing inventions IV, V and VI respectively.

The Applicant submits that claim set IV is a system version of claim set I and includes all of the same features and limitations of claim set I. Each of the features are described with very similar wording and if the Examiner conducts a thorough search on claim set I he should not need to perform an additional search for claim set IV.

Similar comments apply in relation to the pairing of claim sets II and V and claim sets III and VI.

2. In response to the Examiner's request that one set of claims be elected, the Applicant requests election of claim sets I and IV (ie claims 1-3, 8-28, 29-31 and 36-46 and 48).

3. Should the Examiner disagree with the above assessment, the Examiner is invited to suggest ways in which the inventions of claim sets I and IV could be "*separately usable*."

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the further examination of the application can now proceed.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL LAPSTUN

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JACQUELINE ANNE LAPSTUN

  
\_\_\_\_\_

C/o: KIA SILVERBROOK  
Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9818 6711